



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/021,890	10/31/2001	Shinya Kogure	CANO:038	1962

7590 07/26/2005

ROSSI & ASSOCIATES
P.O. Box 826
Ashburn, VA 20146-0826

EXAMINER

BLAIR, DOUGLAS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

DATE MAILED: 07/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/021,890

Applicant(s)

KOGURE ET AL.

Examiner

Douglas B. Blair

Art Unit

2142

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 April 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 1-7 are currently pending in this application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-2 and 4-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,480,884 to Saito in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,804,700 to Terek et al..
4. As to claim 1, Saito teaches a data communication apparatus comprising: an inputter arranged to input file data (col. 5, lines 38-58); a setter arranged to set a subject of an electronic mail to be transmitted (col. 7, lines 1-12); a producer arranged to produce a file name of the file data input by said inputter based on the subject set by the setter (col. 5, lines 38-58); and a transmitter arranged to transmit electronic mail data including the file data input by said inputter, the subject set by said setter, and file name produced by said producer (col. 5, lines 59-67); however, Saito does not explicitly teach the file name being based on the field "SUBJECT:".

Terek teaches a data communication apparatus comprising: an inputter arranged to input file data (col. 9, line 50-col. 10, line 13); a setter arranged to set a field SUBJECT: of a header of an electronic mail to be transmitted; a producer arranged to produce a file name of the file data

Art Unit: 2142

input by said inputter based on the field SUBJECT: set by said setter (col. 9, line 50-col. 10, line 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of Saito regarding emailing images with the teachings of Terek regarding the naming of a file based on the SUBJECT: field of an email because using the SUBJECT: field of an email provides a meaningful name for the file (Terek, col. 1, lines 62-67).

5. As to claim 2, Saito teaches a data communication apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said inputter inputs the file data obtained by reading an image on an original (col. 5, lines 38-58).

6. As to claim 4, Saito teaches a data communication apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said producer produces the file name based on a number of the file data input by said inputter and the subject set by said setter (col. 5, lines 38-58).

7. As to claim 5, Saito teaches a data communication apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said producer produces the file name in accordance with a kind of the file data input by said inputter (col. 5, lines 38-58).

8. As to claims 6-7, they feature the same limitations as claim 1 and are rejected for the same reason as claim 1.

9. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,480,884 to Saito in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,804,700 to Terek et al. in further view of U.S. Patent Number 6,683,700 to Shiota et al..

Art Unit: 2142

10. As to claim 3, the Saito-Terek combination makes obvious the apparatus of claim1, however the Saito-Terek combination does not explicitly teach a detachable memory.

Shiota teaches a data communication apparatus wherein the inputter inputs the file data obtained from a detachable memory (col. 3, lines 54-67).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the Computer Networking art at the time of the invention to combine the teachings of the Saito-Terek combination regarding emailing images with the teachings of Shiota regarding detachable memories because detachable memories are common to digital cameras that produce images (Shiota, col. 1, lines 29-37).

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion


12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas B. Blair whose telephone number is 571-272-3893. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30am-5pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2142

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Douglas Blair

Handwritten signature of Douglas Blair in black ink.Handwritten signature of Kamini Shah in black ink.

KAMINI SHAH
PRIMARY EXAMINER